

Remarks:

Claims 1-4, 11-13, 17 and 18 are pending in the current application. Claims 6-10, 14-20 are withdrawn. Claims 1, 5 and 11 are amended. No new matter has been added. Support for the amended language is provided in the specification and the drawings. The Applicant respectfully traverses the 102 grounds of rejection.

**§102 Rejection(s):**

Claims 1-5, 11-13, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) as being anticipated by US Patent Number 6,795,688 ("Plasson"). Plasson is directed to a method and system for dynamically configuring a device in a personal area network (PAN) whereby the device is configured based on attributes such as location and the degree of mobility of the device.

In Plasson, the master device in the PAN may be one of several devices, i.e., "PAN 301 comprises mobile devices with which a user can travel with relative ease . . . devices 310-340 in PAN 301 typically comprise laptop computer systems, PDAs, cell phones, pagers . . . [and] can also include devices that are local fixed devices and that are added as members to PAN 301." See col. 10, lines 49-55.

Plasson further provides that if "a member device is a portable printer, it is likely that it will be used to actually print when it is deployed in a certain location, and/or with a lower degree of mobility, such as the home, the office, and other fixed, and perhaps semi-fixed sites, such as client sites including visited locales and temporary office structures. It is less likely that it will be used to actually print when in transit, with a higher degree of mobility, as in a vehicle, a train, or a plane. When the member printer is deployed in a semi-fixed locale, it may be configured to print. However, when in transit, it may more commonly be configured in some non-printing standby mode." See col. 4, lines 12-25.

It is respectfully noted that anticipation of claims using a drawing requires that "the picture must show all the claimed structural features and how they are put together" and "[t]he drawings must be evaluated for what they reasonably disclose and suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art." MPEP §2125. Furthermore, anticipation of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 (a), (b) and (c) requires that "each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference," that "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim" and "[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim." MPEP §2131.

Referring to amended claim 1, Plasson fails to teach or suggest all the elements recited in claim 1, as amended. Particularly, Plasson fails to disclose “implementing a unique association between the call management device and each of the plurality of mobile communication devices; configuring the call management device as a primary device in a personal area network (PAN); wherein each of the plurality of the mobile communication devices is configured as a non-primary device in the PAN; processing voice signals transmitted by a first mobile communication device to the call management device, in response to the call management device recognizing the first mobile communication device transmitting a service request, wherein the call management device services the first mobile communication device in exclusion of the other mobile communication devices in the PAN, based on a pre-existing unique association implemented between the call management device and the first mobile communication device.”

Furthermore, referring to claims 5 and 13, Plasson fails to teach a primary vehicle mounted device, such as a hands-free car kit. Plasson instead teaches a printer that is only a transient member of the PAN (i.e., it is not intended to operate while temporarily placed in a vehicle). As such, Plasson teaches a non-primary device that is in a non-functioning (i.e., “non-printing standby mode”). A non-functional portable printer in a vehicle is not an equivalent to an active “hands-free car kit” as claimed in claims 5 and 13. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Since Plasson fails to disclose all the recited elements in the amended claim 5, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 102 grounds of rejection or point out the portions of the cited reference that suggest all such elements with specificity.

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Claims 2-4 and amended claim 5 depend on claim 1 and should be in condition for allowance by the virtue of their dependence on an allowable base claim. Amended claim 11 substantially incorporates the elements of claim 1, therefore claim 11 should also be in condition for allowance. Claims 12-13 depend on claim 11 and should be in condition for allowance by the virtue of their dependence on an allowable base claim.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have expressly argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

It is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe that there are matters relating to this application remaining that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call the Applicant's undersigned attorney.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number (213) 623 2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/F. Jason Far-hadian, Esq./

Date: July 5, 2007

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
F. Jason Far-hadian, Esq.  
Registration No. 42,523

Customer No. 42698